

are going to Atlanta, and we are going to have the baby in Atlanta. She said: No, no, no. You have a choice. You don't have to keep going.

At that point, it clicked. This teacher was telling my wife that she could kill my baby. Lisa realized it real quickly. Lisa said: You realize you are talking about my child.

When I hear of Planned Parenthood cavalierly talking about a choice to kill a baby, it is horrifying.

In this body, the reconciliation is addressed that we are going to continue to because there was a choice made this week. You had a chance to vote for life, and if you voted "no," you voted against life. Don't try to make it any other thing.

The country has a choice coming up this year. It can take a culture of life from conception to death, natural death, or it can continue to value life, as man does, as throwaway, as maybe not good. You see, prioritizing and saying this is what we believe is what makes this life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness worth pursuing.

They told us that Jordan would have trouble. I actually had somebody one time in a town hall say: Well, her quality of life may not be good. You may have done her a disservice. I choked back my angry tears, and I said: You don't know my daughter.

You see, it is that time of the year when elections come around. My daughter just got back home from her job skills training. She is looking for a job. She is 23 years old. She is back home. She is going out to find where she can make a place in this world. She has a smile that will light up a room. Her little chair whips around faster than you can imagine.

I was thinking about even my own election, and my wife looked at me the other night, and she said: You know, you realize you got something coming up this year. I said: What's that? She said: Your secret weapon comes home on Friday. She is daddy's girl.

You see, life is what you make it. Life is not what somebody else says your life is.

When we have a culture of life, abortion is an abomination to that culture of life. It is why we need to continue every day to put forward a culture of life on this world, Mr. Speaker. It is why we will continue to put forward a culture of life that says we value all.

When we do that, no one has to ask where DOUG COLLINS stands. DOUG COLLINS stands with life. DOUG COLLINS stands with those of all. Because I am one who believes that no matter who you see in a day, Mr. Speaker, when you look into their eyes, you see someone of infinite worth, of infinite value, not because of anything they have done, but because of the life that was put into them by their Creator.

It is abortion that takes that away. It is why I will continue to come to this floor as many times as I possibly can and stand for life because that is the life, the liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that our Founders spoke of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RESTORING ARTICLE I AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I appreciate your attention to these matters that come before the House and the House Members that are in attendance, observing in their office, and all the staff people around.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we carry these messages out. I come to the floor tonight to raise a topic that is important to all Americans, especially the Americans who take our Constitution seriously, and even more importantly, those Americans who have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution, and that would include all of our servicemen and -women along with many law enforcement officers and officers of the article III courts, the entire House of Representatives, the entire United States Senate, and, to my knowledge, the entire body of legislators across the country and the State legislators. I have many times—a number of times—taken an oath to support and defend our United States Constitution but, in the State senate, also the constitution of the State of Iowa.

Our Founding Fathers structured our Constitution so that we would have three branches of government, and some say three equal branches of government. I do not completely agree with that assessment, Mr. Speaker. Instead, I contend that the three branches of government were separate, and they are separate. But the judicial branch of government was designed to be the weakest of the three. Our Founding Fathers understood that there would be competition between the branches of government.

So as part of this discussion, I would like to announce into the RECORD here, Mr. Speaker, that our chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Chairman GOODLATTE, has initiated a task force—a task force—that is designed to address the article I overreach of the President of the United States and the executive branch—not only this President, but previous administrations as well.

I appreciate and compliment Chairman GOODLATTE for his insight and foresight for taking this initiative. I thank him for suggesting and then ratifying today that I will be chairing the Task Force on Executive Overreach. It will be comprised of members of the Judiciary Committee, Republicans and Democrats. It will be bipartisan. I had hoped that it would be non-

partisan. Judging from some of the tone in the debate today, there could be a little flavor of partisanship in there, Mr. Speaker. That is fine, because that is how we bring about our disagreements.

In any case, a task force has been set up, and it will function for 6 months. Some time in August its authorization will either expire or it will be reauthorized and extended for another period of time.

The theme is, again, restoring the article I authority of our Congress and to address the executive overreach.

The circumstances that bring us to this point are myriad. The objectives of the task force, as I would design them, and the object of a chair of a committee is to bring out the will of the group.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the object, the plan, and the strategy is this: First, it is my intention to intake all of the input that we get from Democrats and Republicans from the bipartisan side in the committee and to build a rather expansive list of the executive overreach that we have seen from the article II branch of government.

I say it that way so that we bring everything into our consideration. Then once that expansive list is made, then we will pare it down to those things that can be sustained as the authority of this Congress versus the authority of the executive branch of government.

I would point out that the executive overreach isn't only about the unconstitutional overreaches that have taken place, especially recently within this administration, but it is also, Mr. Speaker, about the constitutional overreach when a President will act under authority that maybe has been granted to the executive branch of government by the legislative branch of government, or an authority that has been expanded off of an authority that was granted by the United States Congress.

□ 1830

A big piece of this will be the rules and the regulations that are the authority that we have granted to the executive branch of government over the Administrative Procedures Act.

We know that when the executive branch publishes rules, we have been getting more and more rules that are published. Once they are published for the prescribed amount of time, and the comment periods for the prescribed amount of time are allowed and the American public is allowed to weigh in, at a certain point they have complied with the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act and then the rules go into effect. Often the rules that are written by the executive branch of government are without the purview of Congress, but they have the full force and effect of law. That is troubling to me.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned this. They gave us the republican form of government and a constitutional Republic. This constitutional Republic is

designed to be a limited government, Mr. Speaker. They didn't envision that the Federal Government would grow to the expansive lengths that it has. They thought that they would be able to keep it in a narrow limited form and that the States would be dealing with the more detailed issues that the Federal Government was not the benefit of.

We have the enumerated powers. They intended for us to stay within the enumerated powers. The definitions that have come forward here by Congress, they reached out and stretched the limits of the enumerated powers.

They didn't imagine that there would be speed limits on the dirt trails that had horses and buggies on them, and they didn't imagine that the Federal Government would be subsidizing roads in a way that would allow the Federal Government to set speed limits across this country. That is an example of events that have given the Federal Government—this Congress—some authority tied to the dollars that our Founding Fathers didn't envision, and it is one that I think simply we can understand.

There is a proper role for the Federal Government. There is a proper role in requiring conditions that go along with Federal dollars. I illustrate that point, though, to illustrate how far we have diverged from the intent of our Founding Fathers.

As our Founding Fathers framed the Constitution and established that all laws would be passed here in the United States Congress and not by the executive branch of government and not by the judicial branch of government, that separation of powers was envisioned to be this: Congress has the legislative authority. It is article I. It is article I for a reason, because the voice and the power of the people is vested in this Congress.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned that the policy would come forth here from the various populations of the Thirteen Original Colonies and the States that later joined. Today, if we applied the vision of the Founding Fathers, we would look at 50 States and the territories, and we would imagine that there are—and this is simply close to a fact—320 million people across those 50 States and the territories.

Out of those 320 million people would be generated ideas. There would be grievances that would be brought forward and brought to the Representatives of Congress, and there would be ideas generated to solve the various problems that we have in our country. There might be a consensus that might be formed what the tax rates should be, what the debt burden should be allowed to be, what the size of government should be allowed to be, and what kind of policies might come out of this Congress. Our Founding Fathers envisioned that.

They envisioned then that the voice of the people would be transferred and translated up through and out of the

population into the mind and the heart, any activity of their elected representative.

They envisioned also that, out of the corners of the country, the Thirteen Original Colonies—and now from as far away as Guam to Washington, D.C., the corners of the United States, Alaska to Hawaii, to Florida, to Maine, and down to California certainly—that all of the ideas within that would have to compete with other ideas, and that their elected representatives in this republican form of government that is guaranteed in our Constitution would bring the best of those ideas. Not all of them, not the clutter of bad ideas, but sort the clutter of the ideas so that just the cream of the crop, the best ideas, would come from the corners of the United States and be brought here into this Congress, that an individual Member of Congress, one of the 435, would bring those ideas into the competition of the ideas of the marketplace here.

The ideas of the marketplace here would have to compete against each other. Of the now 435 Members, there would be various ideas that would compete with other ideas. The best ideas that could develop the consensus out of the voice of the people would be sorted here in this Congress, and we would advance those ideas that reflected the will of "we the people." That is the vision of this republican form of government. That is the vision that required that the Congress be established by article I.

The vision for article II was that the executive branch would be headed by a President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. We wouldn't have any Armed Forces if it weren't for Congress having the enumerated power to establish a military—an Army, a Navy, and, subsequent to that, an Air Force.

So the Founding Fathers envisioned the executive branch and the President of the United States—the President, specifically, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces—and that his oath is to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States—that is the oath, so help him, God, today, as is in his oath, although it wasn't in the original oath—and that he take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is the Take Care Clause.

Some of us say somewhat facetiously that the President of the United States took that wrong and decided to execute the Constitution instead of taking care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is something that we will debate and discuss in the task force that addresses the executive overreach, Mr. Speaker.

Our Founding Fathers also established article III, which is the courts. I will speak to that briefly in this segment, Mr. Speaker, because most of the focus of this task force is on the executive overreach. We do need to look into the judicial overreach as well. I believe that there is an effort to give that a re-

view as well. But the Constitution requires that there be a Supreme Court, that they establish a Supreme Court, and then the various other courts are at the discretion of Congress.

I have made this argument to Justice Scalia in somewhat a semiformal setting—I might say an informal setting—a few years ago. I would argue that under the Constitution, if you read article III, the only court that is required by the Constitution is the Supreme Court. It is required that it be led and headed by a Chief Justice.

As you look at the language in the Constitution, I argued that the Supreme Court is not required to be—well, first of all, there are no other Federal courts that are required. The authority to establish them is granted in article III to Congress. Congress could develop all the Federal courts that they choose to, or they could decide to, essentially, abolish any of the Federal districts. In theory, at least, they could abolish all the Federal districts.

The only Federal Court that is required under the Constitution is the Supreme Court. Under constitutional authority, Congress could eliminate and reduce the Federal Court system all the way down to the Supreme Court. There is no requirement that there be nine Justices or seven or five or three. There is a requirement that there be a Chief Justice.

In the end, if Congress wanted to control the judicial branch, they could reduce their judicial branch down to the Chief Justice, and he is not required to have a Supreme Court building or a budget. They could reduce the Chief Justice down to himself or herself, as the case may be, with his own card table, with his own candle, and no staff. That is how narrow and small the judicial branch of government could be if Congress decided to utilize its constitutional authority.

Of course, we don't do that. But there is a history of two judicial Federal districts being abolished by this Congress back in about 1802. It was debated in the House and the Senate and successfully eliminated a couple of Federal districts—I don't suggest that we do that at all, Mr. Speaker, for those who would get on their Twitter account—illustrating the function of the Constitution itself. But the judicial branch of government has now defined it down to that. It explains that the third branch, article III, the third branch of government, was not designed to be a coequal branch of government. It was designed to be the weakest of the three branches of government.

Then *Marbury v. Madison* came along that established judicial review, and off we are to the races and the growth of the judicial branch of government. That can be shrunk or it can be allowed to grow, and its influence can be allowed to grow or it could be shrunk.

But I would make the point, Mr. Speaker, that it isn't only the Supreme Court that weighs in on what the Constitution says. It is each one of us here

in this Chamber and each Senator down at the other end of the United States Capitol Building. We all have our obligation to interpret the Constitution because we all take an oath to uphold it.

We are not taking an oath to uphold it the way the Supreme Court would amend it. In fact, the nine Justices of the Supreme Court—or five, as the case may be—are the last people on the planet who should be amending the Constitution of the United States. Whether it is a literal amendment or whether it is a de facto amendment is what has taken place with regard to the Obergefell case, for example, Mr. Speaker.

The judicial branch of government, article III, is designed to be the weakest of the three branches of government. If it stayed that way or if it becomes that again, we still have the conflict, the struggle for power that is going on between article I, the Congress; article II, the President and the executive branch; article III, the courts; and that static balance that is there between the three branches of government. There is a little tug-of-war going on for the balance between each of those branches of government.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned that it would be impossible to precisely define the differences, the power structure, among the three branches of government. They did, I think, a really good job given the limits of language and imagination, and also the limits of not having a complete crystal ball on what would happen here in this country. But they understood that even though they defined it as precisely as I think was humanly possible in that period of time, or even now today, they understood that each branch of government would jealously protect the authority granted to it within its particular article within the Constitution.

For a long time that is what happened. Even now we have debates about what authority the Congress has versus what authority the President has. That is the heart of the executive overreach task force that was established today in the Judiciary Committee, I would say the brainchild of Chairman GOODLATTE.

I don't believe that the Congress has done a very good job of defending and jealously protecting its constitutional authority. It started a long time ago—someone today said 100 years ago—as Congress began delegating authority to the executive branch of government. It was accelerated with the passage of the Administrative Procedures Act, which sets out the parameters for the executive branch of government to write the rules and regulations that have the full force and effect of law.

That came about, I think, Mr. Speaker, because this Congress was overwhelmed with all of the functions of a growing Federal Government. The various committees and the various task forces that are established here in this Congress grew and emerged out of the duties that this Congress recognized.

But at a certain point, Congress was bogged down with the details of governing. Willingly, to take some of that workload off of their back, they delegated it to the executive branch of government. In doing so, they had to delegate authority to the executive branch of government, too.

Not only was it the workload, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, but it also was sometimes the political heat that is required to do the right thing. I have seen this in the State legislature, and I have seen this in Congress multiple times. Issues come up. You can't reach agreement. One side or the other is scoring political points, sometimes it is both sides scoring political points, and the heat of that gets so great sometimes it brings about a decision here. But also, the heat of that might cause the legislative branch of government to pass that responsibility over to the executive branch, take the heat off, and let them make the decision.

The result of executive decisions taking authority might be—let me pick an example—the waters of the United States rule, where this executive branch, during the terms of this President, President Obama, decided that they wanted to regulate a lot more of the real estate in the United States of America. I looked back at a time in about 1992 when I saw another effort to do the same thing as there was a designation in my State that was driven by the EPA to designate 115 streams in Iowa as protected streams.

Looking at that list of protected streams, I began wondering why would they call some drainage ditches protected streams. I read down through the rule. In there, it said, in order to preserve the natural riparian beauty, these streams, according to their geographically defined boundaries in the rule—which I never actually saw the geographically defined boundaries. They just said they were there. I don't know that they were. But according to their geographically defined boundaries, these streams shall be protected streams, and these streams and waters hydrologically connected to them. I will put that in quotes, Mr. Speaker, “and waters hydrologically connected to them.”

□ 1845

When I read the language and I saw that that was the rule that was published, I began to go and deliver the public comment.

I asked the representatives of the rule writers: What does “hydrologically connected to” mean?

Their answer was: We don't know.

And I said: Then take it out of the rule.

No. We can't.

Do you mean you are representing something, and you do not know what it means, but you just know you can't take it out?

That's right. We can't take it out. This is the published rule, and now we have to get this rule passed.

In any case, that brought about a battle within the State of Iowa. Eventually, they got the rule in that said these streams and waters hydrologically connected to them will be regulated by the regulators and that they will decide what practices the rightful property owner can implement on that real estate that they have now defined to be within the regulation of the government. The phrase “waters hydrologically connected to” thereby became the target of years and years of litigation—of, perhaps, nearly 20 years of litigation or of maybe even more than 20 years of litigation. I guess we would be at 25 or so years of litigation.

Finally, the courts concluded that the phrase “hydrologically connected to” was too vague to be able to enforce it, and the collection—the menagerie—of the article III Court's ruling on an initiative that was brought forward by the executive branch of government that was not the intention of the legislative branch of government tied all three branches of government together in confusion that eroded the property rights of people who were guaranteed those property rights under the Fifth Amendment.

All of that was being litigated through that period of time when we saw the Kelo decision when the Court decided they could amend the Constitution, and the minority opinion was written by Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. I stood on this floor and almost unknowingly quoted her minority opinion because we had come to the same conclusion independently that the Court had taken three words out of the Fifth Amendment, and those three words were “for public use.” So now, effectively, the Fifth Amendment reads: nor shall private property be taken without just compensation.

We know a little about that debate taking place in the Presidential race because we have a candidate who believes that that is the right thing—to take people's private property for private use if you can convince the government that would be confiscating it, that it is of better use if it pays more taxes. I disagree with that, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that the Kelo decision will be reversed one day when we appoint constitutionalists to the judicial branch of government. I believe also in the result of that, over a period of time, if we get the right President who will make the right appointments to the Supreme Court.

What I have illustrated here is how the three branches of government can get involved in a convoluted conflict, and in that convoluted conflict, the tension between the three branches of government was designed to get sorted out so that we would be back to the Constitution, itself, and that the Constitution would rule. But when the Supreme Court effectively strikes three words out of the Fifth Amendment to our Constitution, then we have the Court's ruling without the will of the people, and the will of the people is

going to be reflected through, especially and first, the House of Representatives—the quick reaction strike force. There is a reason we all take the oath to uphold the Constitution. It is so we understand it, and we define it. We take our oath seriously, and we defend it.

In the other two parts of that, when you had an executive branch that initiated a policy—protected streams—that wasn't the initiative of the legislature, then you have a superlegislature outside the purview of the legislative body. My detractors will turn around and say: But any rule that is passed can be nullified by the United States Congress. So why do you worry about that? Why don't you just do your job in Congress and nullify the rules if you don't like them? Mr. Speaker, it works a little bit differently than that, of course, especially when you have a President of the United States who will veto that legislation that would be nullifying the rule; so we are back into the circle again.

If the President initiates a rule without regard to whether there is a court ruling on that rule, the legislature then would be obligated to nullify the rule. The difficulty of that is it takes a supermajority here then to undo something that appointed—but not elected—executive branch officials have initiated often without the knowledge of the President of the United States, himself. That is an upside-down way to get things done.

It is supposed to be and is designed to be the will of the people—the voice of the people—of the United States. They initiate the policy. They send that policy up through Congress. Congress is to bring it before our committees. It evaluates the various ideas, competes, and debates those ideas. It votes them through the various subcommittees and committees after having hearings so that the public can see what is going on—all out in the open, all out in the sunlight. We bring it here to the floor of the Congress and vote on it; and if the Senate agrees, it becomes law. There was not designed to be a superlegislature within the executive branch; but, Mr. Speaker, that is what we have today. We have thousands and thousands of pages of regulations that are initiated by a robust executive branch of government.

I expect that, in the duration of this administration, as we have heard from the President of the United States, he intends to make his days count as we count down to the end of his Presidency. I take him at his word. He has had a robust approach to stretching the limits of the executive branch of government throughout all of his time in office. Now he is sitting in a place where he has the appropriations he needs for the functioning of the Federal Government all the way up until September 30. By September 30, this Congress is going to be in a place where they are seeing the last weeks of a Presidential campaign play themselves

out in October and then in early November. So we are probably right at 5 weeks. Let's see. Five weeks from the end of the fiscal year will be the vote for the Presidency, and absentee balloting will be taking place at the same time.

The President of the United States has all of the levers that he needs, he has got all of the tools that he needs, and he has got the funding that he needs. He also has the robust idea that the executive branch of government should be stronger, not weaker, and that it should do more, not less. If we wonder about that, Mr. Speaker, we can look around at some of the President's actions and those of the executive branch of government that I take great issue with. Many of them are tied up in the development, in the implementation, of ObamaCare.

ObamaCare, itself, Mr. Speaker, was legislation that was passed by hook, by crook, by legislative shenanigan. March 22, 2010, was the final passage, and it was a sad day for America because the will of the people was not reflected in this Congress that day. It was a dramatic time to be here. Those who will argue will say: Oh, the House passed this legislation, and the Senate passed this legislation, and it actually was a function of the legislative body. I repeat again—hook, crook, legislative shenanigan. It is not only I who says that, Mr. Speaker. There have been Democrats who have voiced the same thing, but there are far fewer of them these days as a result of force-feeding ObamaCare to the United States Congress.

As the President began implementing ObamaCare, he began changing the law. He made some changes along the way. For example, the employer mandate was delayed. The individual mandate was delayed. Some of it was litigated over to the Supreme Court. Some of these changes were not. He decided which components of the law he wanted to ignore and which ones he wanted to enforce. He took an oath, though, to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is all of them. That is not part of them. Yet, as we went through ObamaCare time after time after time, there were changes made along the way in the implementation and enforcement of ObamaCare, and that brought about a great deal of confusion in this country, and it upset a lot of people. It disadvantaged a lot of people, and it advantaged some people.

He granted waiver after waiver for his favorite groups and entities that were, I will say, people who were typically considered to be his supporters. I didn't see much relief for the people who were typically not considered to be his supporters, such as the Little Sisters of the Poor, for example. They are in the business of having to litigate their religious freedom versus an imposition of the Federal Government's that, under all of their health insurance policies, they are now commanded to fund contraceptives, which violates

their religious freedom. By the way, it violates my religious convictions as well. So we have a very robust President who has laid out a whole series of demands not only through ObamaCare legislation, but also we have seen this happen with immigration.

The President has said publicly 22 times “I don't have the constitutional authority to do what you want me to do” when he has been talking to illegal immigrants who are in America and are pressing this government to change the policy to accommodate them in the form of amnesty, which I have described on this floor many times, Mr. Speaker. The President said 22 times: “I don't have the constitutional authority to do this.”

After he was well vented in his position of explaining the Constitution right out here at a high school in Washington, D.C., the President answered a question from one of the students at the high school. He said, “I used to teach the Constitution,” which he did for 10 years as an adjunct professor at the University of Chicago. He taught constitutional law. He said that the job of Congress is to write the laws, that the job of the President and of the executive branch is to enforce the laws, and that the job of the judicial branch of government is to interpret the laws.

I would bring this back to Chief Justice Roberts, who said clearly in his confirmation hearing some years ago that his job as a Justice is to call the balls and strikes. I agreed with that, and it was very encouraging to hear that, and I certainly supported his confirmation. Yet I see that on June 24 of last year—that would be a Thursday—in the opinion on ObamaCare that was written by Chief Justice Roberts, in a narrow majority opinion where Chief Justice Roberts joined with four other Justices, they decided they could write words into ObamaCare, itself. “Or Federal Government” would be the three words. Maybe the three words they took out of the Fifth Amendment, “for public use,” they get to put in a bank somewhere, and when they need to add some words into law, they can just borrow them from that little word bank. If they strike them out of the Constitution, maybe the three words would be left in the word bank, and the Supreme Court could then pull three words out by choice and say, “or Federal Government.”

Now ObamaCare reads, “an exchange established by the State”—insert “or Federal Government.” Now, that is what happened as to that decision on ObamaCare on June 24, Thursday, the following day. The Supreme Court announced that they had created a new command in the Constitution. It is not just a new right. Remember, I said the Justices of the Supreme Court should be the last people on the planet to amend the Constitution or to discover any new language in it. They are to call the balls and strikes. That is what I agree with, and that is part of my oath, to defend the Constitution in

that fashion. The Supreme Court, instead, inserted those words into ObamaCare, “or Federal Government.”

The following day, they created a command that says not just that there is a new right to same-sex marriage, Mr. Speaker, but that there is a command that, if the States are to conduct or to honor civil marriage, they shall conduct and honor also same-sex marriages without regard to the convictions of their people, who no longer enjoy the 10th Amendment authority to establish that policy on marriage within the States. The Federal Government took that onto themselves, and they issued not just a right to same-sex marriage but a command that everyone, especially the States and the political subdivisions thereof, shall honor same-sex marriage. That is a breathtaking overreach of the Supreme Court. It would be worse than the worst nightmare that any of our Founding Fathers ever would have had with regard to the limitations of this government.

So we are sitting here today with a Federal Government that has been distorted beyond what would be the belief of our Founding Fathers, and they had their share of fears. This Congress needs to reassert itself. It needs to reestablish its constitutional authority. It needs to take a good, hard look at the article I authority that is vested to it in the Constitution, itself, and recognize that all legislative powers exist here in the House and in the Senate. The overreach of the executive branch takes place sometimes because Congress wanted to take the heat off of us, and we gave that responsibility over to the executive branch of government. Sometimes the President decides he wants to do things outside the bounds of his constitutional authority. Sometimes it is a mix of the two, and sometimes it is the President who enjoys the majority support of his party in the House and/or in the Senate. It is more likely that in this Congress that the Members of his party will accept an overreach of a President of their own party than they will an overreach of a President of the opposite party.

□ 1900

It is also true, Mr. Speaker, that we have different views on what is executive overreach and what the Constitution says.

In fact, in some of the debate today, I said that the Constitution has to mean what it says. The very literal words that are in the Constitution have to mean what they say and they have to mean to all of us what they were understood to mean at the time of ratification of the base document of the Constitution and, also, of the various amendments as we move along through the amendments in the Constitution.

We need to have enough history to understand what those amendments and what the Constitution meant to the people that ratified it, and then we

need to recognize that the Constitution itself is an intergenerational guarantee, an intergenerational document signed off on by our Founding Fathers with their hand and agreed to in an oath to that Constitution by millions of Americans over time.

Many of them pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to preserve, support, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

It is a document that is fixed into the letter of the words that are there in the Constitution and the understanding of those words, not living and breathing, but an intergenerational contractual guarantee from our Founding Fathers down to our descendants, as far as they shall go to the end of the Republic, should it ever end. I pray it does never end as long as this Earth exists.

So the multiple generational great, great, great—many times great-grandfathers all the way to the Founding Fathers said: Here is a contract, and I am going to pass this contract on to the next generation. The next generation has to preserve, protect, and defend it and then pass it to the next generation and the next generation and the next generation.

As Ronald Reagan said, freedom is not something that you inherited. It is something that has to be preserved and fought for each generation and defended each generation. So if we lose the understanding of what the Constitution means, we also have lost our Constitution itself, Mr. Speaker.

This task that we have is to preserve this language: “All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.” It is simple, pure, beautiful, worth preserving, protecting, fighting for, bleeding for and, if need be, dying for.

That is why our honorable and noble military men and women take an oath to support this Constitution, because it is worth defending. They are not defending the President of the United States specifically. They are defending this Constitution when they go into battle.

We need to defend it here in the House of Representatives. We have a task force now to address the executive overreach and will be defining the unconstitutional overreach. I am willing to accept the President's definition on the constitutional limitations with regard to immigration.

When the President said he doesn't have the authority to establish and pass amnesty legislation, I agree with him. It is an enumerated power here in this Constitution that is preserved for the Congress to establish a uniform naturalization, and that has been defined by the courts to mean the immigration policies of the United States.

If we get this right, we will have a Congress that is empowered more, but also an empowered Congress that is more accountable to we, the people.

As Congress steps up and says let's claw that executive overreach power

back into the House of Representatives and back into the United States Senate, what we are really saying, Mr. Speaker, is let's claw that executive overreach power and authority back here and hand it back to we, the people.

Now, let's go back and turn our ear to we, the people, so that this republican form of government that is guaranteed to us in this Constitution can gather the best ideas from all across this land and bring those ideas here to Washington, D.C., where the ideas compete with each other. The best ideas float to the top like the cream rises to the top, and the public can look in and they can weigh in.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we need more oversight into the executive branch of government. I have drafted and introduced legislation that addresses some of this in a way, I will put out here, to perhaps be a little provocative to start some ideas. Then the competition of ideas, the best ones, as I said, need to float to the top.

That would be legislation that does this: It requires of this mountain and myriad of regulations that we have that go on in perpetuity, that can't be practically reduced or shrunk down or nullified by this Congress—as long as the President is willing to veto a nullification bill and push it back at us, the legislation that I am proposing that sunsets all of the regulations over a period of 10 years sunsets any new regulation at the end of 10 years and it requires Congress to have an affirmative vote before any regulation can have a force and effect of law.

We have passed out of the floor of the House here once, perhaps more than that, what we call the REINS Act. This comes from a retired Member of Congress, a friend, a former ranger, Jeff Davis of Kentucky, who initiated the legislation that there would be a requirement of an affirmative vote of Congress before a regulation that had more than \$100 million of impact on our economy could take effect.

That addresses this. It addresses this going forward with new regulation. It doesn't go backward to other regulations. All of the old regulations are essentially de facto grandfathered by the REINS Act.

The legislation that I had put together before he introduced the REINS Act was more detailed. This legislation is called the Sunset Act. It sunsets all regulations, but it sunsets them in increments of 10 percent of the regulations from each department each year for 10 years.

The departments have to offer up their regulations. They can sort which ones they want to expose to Congress for a vote over a period of 10 years. But over 10 years, they have to offer up their regulations here to Congress.

Congress then evaluates those regulations. Any Member of Congress can come in and offer an amendment to those regulations, maybe an amendment to strike, maybe an amendment to add.

Maybe there are people in this Congress that want more regulations, not less, and they would like to write them into law and affirmatively vote them in.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that idea of sunseting all regulations—10 percent a year for 10 years incrementally—is coupled with the idea of sunseting any new regulation, also, at the end of 10 years and requiring an affirmative vote on any regulation before all new regulations of any kind.

Doing so then restrains the executive branch of government and makes the legislative branch of government responsible to the people.

Our regulators that are writing these rules will know that, if they write a rule that is egregious to the people, the people that have not been heard from the executive branch of government, when they go into the office of, say, the EPA and they press their case to Gina McCarthy, for example, and her people, they don't have a motive to listen because they are insulated from the accountability to the people.

If they knew that those same individuals that are aggrieved by the proposed regulation can come to visit their Member of Congress and press their demand on their Member of Congress, they have to know that that Member of Congress will come forward, come down here to the floor of the House of Representatives and offer an amendment to strike those regulations or amend those regulations so that it is acceptable to we, the people. That is a vision to restrain an overgrowth of the executive branch of government, Mr. Speaker.

I advocate that as one of the things to consider, but neither do I think that I have all the good ideas. There are 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 100 Members of the Senate. There are good ideas that come into every one of our offices from the 750,000 or so people that each of us represent.

With the ideas that come from the public, if we sort them in the fashion envisioned by our Founding Fathers, if we limit the overgrowth of the executive branch of government, we take the responsibility back to us, it will press on us, Mr. Speaker, the kind of changes that are good for the people in this Republic, that are good for the responsibilities of the Members of the House and of the Senate. We can take America, and we can take America onwards and upwards to the next level of our ascending destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence and your attention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SAVE CHRISTIANS FROM GENOCIDE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call my colleagues' at-

tention and the attention of the public to the legislation I have proposed.

The bill number is H.R. 4017. This act is the Save Christians from Genocide Act. I would ask my colleagues to consider cosponsoring this legislation. A number have already done so.

I would ask the public to make sure that they know that their Congressperson knows exactly what is going on with H.R. 4017 and that they would hope that their Member of Congress would also be a cosponsor of the bill.

By calling your Congressman's office, I am sure the Members of Congress will be very happy to hear your opinion. Many Members of this body need to know that their constituents support the Save Christians from Genocide Act, H.R. 4017.

What this legislation does is set a priority for immigration and refugee status for those Christians who are now under attack, targeted for genocide in Syria, Iran, Iraq, Libya, and Pakistan.

Genocide is taking place. Mass murder is happening. Christians have been targeted for slaughter and elimination by radical Islamic terrorists in the Middle East. We have to acknowledge that or millions—not just hundreds of thousands—of Christian brethren will die.

Another group, the Yazidis, have also been similarly targeted, and my bill covers those people as well, although they are not Christians.

The greatest threat to our country today is radical Islamic terrorism. So it should not be a difficult decision on the part of our President or the people or the public or this body to decide that we are going to do what we can to save Christians who have been targeted for slaughter by those very same forces who are now the greatest threat to our own security. However, what we have is not just a foot dragging, but a negative response from this administration.

Our President has been unable to defeat or even to turn back the onslaught of radical Islamic terrorism. Yes. I have to admit this President was dealt a pretty bad hand. Things were not good when he took over in the Middle East.

I think the mistake the United States made—it is clear that, when we sent our troops into Iraq, we did indeed break a stability that has caused us problems. It was a bad situation at that time when our President became President.

Well, this President has turned a bad situation into a catastrophe. We have almost lost—and with our President's policies, we would have lost—Egypt to radical Islamic terrorism.

Our President supported the Muslim Brotherhood leader of Egypt, a man named Mohamed Morsi, who was at that time President of Egypt during the early years of this administration.

President Obama went all the way to Egypt in order to give a speech, standing beside President Morsi to the Muslim people of that region.

What it was was basically an acceptance of the Muslim Brotherhood, which people now know is the philosophical godfather to all of the radical Islamic terrorist movements that now slaughter Christians and threaten the peace and stability of the world.

Our President encouraged them in the beginning, feeling, if we did, again, treat someone nicely, they will respect you.

What happened? Moderate regimes and, yes, regimes in the Middle East that were not democratic, were less than free, have been replaced with radical Islamists who mean to destroy the Middle East and turn it into a caliphate, radical Islamic terrorists who conduct terrorist raids into Western countries, radical Islamic terrorists who murder people in Turkey, in Russia, in San Bernardino.

This is what has happened since this President took over and reached out with the hand of friendship and understanding to those who would become the radical Islamic terrorists of that region and, I might say, a threat to the entire world, including the people of every city in the United States.

□ 1915

Had Egypt been left the way that the President wanted it to be, had we instead not supported the effort by the Egyptian people to rid themselves of Morsi and his government at the time when Morsi was trying to destroy their supreme court and their court system, at a time when Morsi was trying to establish a caliphate that is totally rejected by the Egyptian people, had our President been able to support General el-Sisi, perhaps the revolution could have happened peacefully. But, instead, Morsi was removed by General el-Sisi when he tried to betray the Egyptian people.

Today General el-Sisi now has been elected by a landslide in Egypt. And General el-Sisi—now President el-Sisi—has done everything he can to try to find a way to reconcile between Islam and the other faiths, of not only the region but the world.

President el-Sisi is the only leader, the only President of Egypt ever to go to a Coptic Christian church and help them celebrate Christmas. This was an incredible act on his part. He also went to the Muslim clerics and personally pleaded with the leadership of the Muslim faith in Egypt and in that part of the world, pleaded for a rejection of the radicalism and pleaded for a rejection of those people who would commit acts of violence on others and try to repress the freedom of religion of other people.

President el-Sisi begged and pleaded for the Egyptian clerics, the Muslim clerics to come out strongly for respect of other people's faiths, respect of freedom of religion and tolerance toward others. When have we ever had a leader like that? Our President resented him because he overthrew a man who was in the Muslim Brotherhood who was trying to lay the foundation for a caliphate of terrorists who would have